



Page 5

December 19, 2008

Minutes: November 13, 2008 Merger Team 2A/4A Meeting for Bonner Bridge

adequately prepare for the Concurrence Point 4B meeting. Beth responded that was acceptable to NCDOT.

Ron Sechler asked if work bridge pile impacts were included in the SAV impact amounts in Table 2. Beth responded that work bridge piles were included.

Bill Biddlecome said that he wanted to state for the record that the USACE wants all SAVs and wetlands bridged to the maximum extent practicable.

Chris Militscher asked about the timing for Phase II and whether or not the Merger Team was concurring today on anything related to Phase II. Beth responded that the Merger Team was not concurring today on anything related to Phase II. She also said that the proposed concurrence form indicates that combined Concurrence Point 2A/4A meetings will be held prior to the completion of the final design for each subsequent phase of the Preferred Alternative. Bill Biddlecome added that that was his recommendation. Chris said this was acceptable to him.

Cathy Brittingham asked about the distinction between temporary and permanent wetland impacts. For example, with haul roads, are the impacts considered to be temporary or permanent? Beth responded that the impacts were considered to be temporary if they were used only for construction (and subsequently removed), no matter how long the duration of the activity, and not a part of the permanent roadway facility. Cathy said that since the construction is estimated to last for 4 years, is it really appropriate to consider these as temporary impacts. Bill Biddlecome responded that the permits can contain conditions requiring that the temporarily impacted wetlands be restored and regain their previous functionality, or else the impact would have to be mitigated. He also did not agree that 1 to 1 mitigation was appropriate for this situation. Bill said that the issue of permanent versus temporary impacts needs to be discussed again at a later date once the amount of the temporary impacts is better known. Cathy added that the temporary wetland impacts would need to be closely monitored in case they need to be reclassified as permanent impacts. Ron Sechler said that the same consideration applies to SAVs because it is not possible to predict how the holes from temporary bridge piers will fill back in. Chris Militscher agreed that the issue of permanent versus temporary impacts can be dealt with later. Rodger Rochelle said he does not know how long work bridges and haul roads might have to remain in place, but he could ask some contractors for an estimated duration. Cathy said that they have seen standard language on haul roads in contracts in the past. Bill reiterated that this issue would be dealt with in the permitting process and that the permit would contain conditions for restoration of wetlands.

Ron Sechler asked if SAVs in the Oregon Inlet area had been mapped recently. Beth replied that the most recent SAV mapping is from late-2007; however, the Design-Build contractor will be provided with new aerial photography and required to ground truth the 2007 SAV mapping.